A

PEGUAM NEGARA MALAYSIA

v.

DR MICHEAL JEYAKUMAR DEVARAJ

B

COURT OF APPEAL, PUTRAJAYA
LOW HOP BING JCA
ABDUL WAHAB PATAIL JCA
ANANTHAM KASINATHER JCA
[CIVIL APPEAL NO: W-01-215-2011]

C

10 OCTOBER 2011

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW: *Remedies - Leave for judicial review - Appeal against - Writ of quo warranto, mandamus and certiorari - Scope of - Authority exercised by officers - Whether qualification and*

D

appointment of officers challenged - Whether writ of quo warranto correct relief - Whether officers had discretion to disburse funds from the Federal Consolidated Funds - Whether officers compelled to allocate funds - Whether policy consideration and management prerogative of officers reviewable and justiciable

E

This was the attorney general's appeal against the decision of the High Court in allowing leave for judicial review under O. 53 Rules of the High Court 1980 to the respondent's application by way of notice of motion ('the notice of motion'). The respondent, a

F

member of parliament, *vide* the notice of motion had sought the following reliefs, *inter alia*, (i) a writ of *quo warranto* against the Director General of the Implementation and Coordination Unit of the Prime Minister's Department ('the DG'), the Director of the Perak State Development Office ('the director') and the

G

Government of Malaysia (hereinafter collectively referred to as 'the appellants'), to show cause and give information as to their authority to exercise, vest and/or delegate the discretion to approve and disburse funds from the Federal Consolidated Funds which are allocated in the Federal Budget 2010 and any annual

H

Federal Budget to the Prime Minister's Department for all parliamentary constituencies ('the allocation') and to explain their respective roles and relationship in relation to one another (ii) orders of *mandamus* to compel the appellants to specify information in respect of the disbursements of the allocation, in particular for

I

the Sungai Siput Parliamentary Constituency ('Sungai Siput') and (iii) an order of *certiorari* to quash the director's decision in the

letter dated 12 October 2010 and consequently an order of *mandamus* to compel the DG and/or the director to grant the respondent's application *vide* letter dated 9 July 2010 for funds from the allocation for Sungai Siput for the year 2010 ('the 2010 application'). The questions of law which arose for determination by this court were (a) whether a writ of *quo warranto* was the correct relief (b) whether the learned judge was correct in granting leave for an order of *mandamus* to compel the appellants to specify information in respect of the disbursement of the allocation, and to compel the appellants to grant the respondent's application *vide* letter dated 9 July 2010 and (c) whether the reliefs sought by the respondent in the notice of motion were matters of policy considerations and management prerogative of the DG and/or the director and therefore non-reviewable and non-justiciable.

Held (allowing the appeal)
Per Low Hop Bing JCA delivering the judgment of the court:

(1) In his capacity as Member of Parliament, the respondent had already sought and obtained in parliament the relevant information. The respondent was not challenging the qualifications and appointments of the DG and the director or any legal flaw in their qualifications and appointments. Thus, the relief sought was outside the scope of a writ of *quo warranto*. (paras 17 & 19)

(2) The disbursement of the allocation was entrusted to the DG and/or the director, who would consider each application in accordance with the guidelines for that purpose. This involved an exercise of discretion based on a detailed and comprehensive process of evaluation. The respondent had failed to show that there was a legal or statutory duty on the part of the DG and/or the director as a matter of course to approve his 2010 application nor established the existence of a duty of a public nature, the performance of which was imperative and not optional or discretionary. The respondent's notice of motion was premised on the DG's and/or director's discretion to approve and disburse funds. There was not an *iota* of law that the DG and/or the director must do so. (para 30)

(3) The applications for the allocation could only be decided by the DG and/or the director in line with policy considerations and management prerogative. In the process of evaluation, the DG and/or the director must comprehensively balance and safeguard the disbursement of the allocation, consistent with government policy and guidelines. The courts did not possess the knowledge of policy considerations that underlie the decisions pursuant to the DG and/or the director's evaluation. Thus, the issues raised in the notice of motion were not judicially reviewable and hence, not justiciable. (paras 35 & 36)

[Setting aside order of the High Court and substituting it with an order that the notice of motion be dismissed.]

Bahasa Malaysia *Translation Of Headnotes*

Ini adalah rayuan peguam negara terhadap keputusan Mahkamah Tinggi dalam membenarkan permohonan responden melalui notis usul ('notis usul') bagi kebenaran semakan kehakiman di bawah A. 53 Kaedah-Kaedah Mahkamah Tinggi 1980. Responden, seorang ahli parlimen, melalui notis usul telah memohon relif-relif berikut, antara lain, (i) satu writ *quo warranto* terhadap Ketua Pengarah Unit Penyelarasan Pelaksanaan di Jabatan Perdana Menteri ('KP'), Pengarah Pejabat Pembangunan Negeri Perak ('pengarah') dan Kerajaan Malaysia (selepas ini dirujuk secara kolektif sebagai 'perayu-perayu'), untuk menunjuk sebab dan memberi maklumat berkenaan kuasa mereka dalam melaksanakan, meletakkan dan/atau mewakilkan budibicara untuk meluluskan dan mengagihkan dana daripada Kumpulan Wang Disatukan yang telah diperuntukkan dalam Bajet Persekutuan 2010 dan mana-mana Bajet Persekutuan tahunan kepada Jabatan Perdana Menteri bagi kesemua kawasan pengundian parlimen ('peruntukan') dan mejelaskan peranan dan perhubungan masing-masing di antara satu sama lain (ii) perintah *mandamus* untuk memaksa perayu-perayu memberikan maklumat berkenaan pengagihan peruntukan, terutamanya bagi kawasan pengundian parlimen Sungai Siput ('Sungai Siput') dan (iii) perintah *certiorari* bagi membatalkan keputusan pengarah dalam surat bertarikh 12 Oktober 2010 dan seterusnya perintah *mandamus* untuk memaksa KP dan/atau pengarah membenarkan permohonan responden melalui suratnya bertarikh 9 Julai 2010 bagi dana dari peruntukan Sungai Siput

untuk tahun 2010 ('permohonan 2010'). Soalan perundangan yang berbangkit untuk ditentukan oleh mahkamah ini adalah (a) sama ada writ *quo warranto* adalah relif yang betul (b) sama ada yang arif hakim betul dalam memberi kebenaran bagi perintah *mandamus* untuk memaksa perayu-perayu memberikan maklumat berkenaan pengagihan peruntukan dan memaksa perayu-perayu supaya membenarkan permohonan responden melalui surat bertarikh 9 Julai 2010 dan (c) sama ada relif-relif yang dipohon oleh responden di dalam notis usul adalah berkenaan hal-hal pertimbangan polisi dan pengurusan prerogatif KP dan/atau pengarah dan oleh itu tidak boleh dikaji atau diadili.

Diputuskan (membenarkan rayuan)
Oleh Low Hop Bing HMR menyampaikan penghakiman mahkamah:

(1) Dalam kapasitinya sebagai ahli parlimen, responden telah pun memohon dan mendapat maklumat berkenaan di parlimen. Responden tidak mencabar kelayakan dan pelantikan KP dan pengarah atau kecacatan undang-undang dalam kelayakan dan pelantikan mereka. Oleh itu, relif yang dipohon adalah di luar lingkungan writ *quo warranto*.

(2) Pengagihan peruntukan telah diamanahkan kepada KP dan/atau pengarah, yang akan mempertimbangkan setiap permohonan berdasarkan garis panduan bagi tujuan tersebut. Ini melibatkan penggunaan budi bicara berdasarkan proses penilaian yang terperinci dan menyeluruh. Responden telah gagal menunjukkan bahawa terdapatnya tugasan undang-undang atau statutori bagi KP dan/atau pengarah bagi membenarkan permohonan 2010 atau pun membuktikan terdapatnya tugasan awam, pelaksanaannya di mana adalah penting dan bukannya secara pilihan atau mengikut budi bicara. Notis usul responden adalah tertakluk kepada budi bicara KP dan/atau pengarah untuk membenarkan dan mengagihkan dana-dana. Tiada undang-undang bahawa KP dan/atau pengarah mesti membuat sedemikian.

(3) Permohonan peruntukan hanya boleh diputuskan oleh KP dan/atau pengarah berdasarkan pertimbangan polisi dan pengurusan prerogatif. Dalam proses penaksiran, KP dan/atau pengarah mesti, secara komprehensif, menimbang dan melindungi pengagihan peruntukan, konsisten dengan polisi kerajaan dan garis panduan. Mahkamah tidak mempunyai pengetahuan

pertimbangan polisi yang menjadi asas keputusan menurut penaksiran KP dan/atau pengarah. Oleh itu, isu-isu yang dibangkitkan dalam notis usul tidak boleh dikaji secara penghakiman dan tidak boleh diadili.

[Mengenepikan perintah Mahkamah Tinggi dan menggantikannya dengan perintah supaya notis usul ditolak.]

Case(s) referred to:

Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for Civil Service [1984] 3 All ER 935 ***(refd)***

Hong Leong Equipment Sdn Bhd v. Liew Fook Chuan & Other Appeals [1997] 1 CLJ 665 CA ***(refd)***

Koon Hoi Chow v. Pretam Singh [1972] 1 LNS 56 HC ***(refd)***

Kumpulan Perangsang Selangor Bhd v. Zaid Mohd Noh [1997] 2 CLJ 11 SC ***(refd)***

R Rama Chandran v. Industrial Court of Malaysia & Anor [1997] 1 CLJ 147 SC ***(refd)***

Legislation referred to:

Federal Constitution, art. 8(1)

Rules of the High Court 1980, O. 53

Specific Relief Act 1950, ss. 44(1), 49

For the appellant - Suzana Atan (Narkunavathy Sundareson with her) SFC
For the respondent - Dato' Ambiga Sreenevasan (Mahaletchumi Balakrishnan with him); M/s Sreenevasan

[Appeal from High Court, Kuala Lumpur; Judicial Review No: R1-25-474-2010]

[Editor's note: For the High Court judgment, please see Dr Michael Jeyakumar Devaraj v. Ketua Pengarah Unit Penyelarasan Pelaksanaan Di Jabatan Perdana Menteri & Ors [2011] 1 LNS 72.]

Reported by Kumitha Abdul Majid

JUDGMENT

Low Hop Bing JCA:

Appeal

[1] This is the Attorney General's appeal against the decision of the learned High Court Judge who had on 25 February 2011 allowed the respondent's application by way of notice of motion ("the notice of motion") for leave for judicial review under O. 53 of the Rules of the High Court 1980 ("O. 53").

Notice Of Motion

[2] In essence, the notice of motion sought the following reliefs:

(1) A writ of *quo warranto* against the appellants, *viz* the Director General of the Implementation and Coordination Unit of the Prime Minister's Department ("the DG"), the Director of the Perak State Development Office ("the Director") and the Government of Malaysia, to show cause and give information as to their authority to exercise, vest and/or delegate the discretion to approve and disburse funds from the Federal Consolidated Funds which are allocated in the Federal Budget 2010 and any annual Federal Budget to the Prime Minister's Department for all parliamentary constituencies ("the Allocation") and to explain their respective roles and relationship in relation to one another;

(2) Orders of *mandamus* to compel the appellants to specify information in respect of the disbursement of the Allocation, in particular for the Sungai Siput Parliamentary Constituency ("Sungai Siput");

(3) Declarations that, in accordance with art. 8(1) of the Federal Constitution (art. 8(1)), the Allocation must be provided and made available to all Members of Parliament equally regardless of political affiliations and that the Director's decision in the letter dated 12 October 2010 is a breach of art. 8(1) and therefore unconstitutional and void;

(4) An order of *certiorari* to quash the Director's decision in the letter dated 12 October 2010 and consequently an order of *mandamus* to compel the DG and/or the Director to grant the respondent's application *vide* letter dated 9 July 2010 for funds from the Allocation for Sungai Siput for the year 2010 ("the 2010 application"); and

(5) Damages and costs.

Factual Background

[3] A narrative of the factual background serves to put this appeal in proper perspective. There is a time-honoured saying that when the facts are clearly and accurately established, the law will take care of itself.

[4] The respondent is the Member of Parliament for Sungai Siput.

[5] The respondent made an application for funds under the Allocation in 2010.

[6] The Director *vide* letter dated 26 July 2010 informed the respondent that:

(1) As of 25 July 2010, 56 projects valued at RM1.72 million had been approved for Sungai Siput, nine of which valued at RM1.15 million were being implemented, while 47 projects valued at RM561,865.15 had been completed;

(2) The respondent's application for RM50,000 for victims of natural disasters, to be deposited in the Land Office, cannot be considered because there was no allocation for that purpose. It was suggested that the respondent submit the list of victims concerned together with police report for consideration, so that there would be no overlapping with contributions from other Government agencies; and

(3) Regarding the respondent's proposal for funding the relevant Parent-Teachers' Associations ("PTAs") and other bodies, the respondent was requested to submit a list of the names of the PTAs and particulars of bank accounts for consideration.

[7] *Vide* letter dated 24 August 2010, the respondent provided the details requested by the Director and sought the Director's clarification about the approved projects.

[8] Subsequently, the respondent, *vide* letter dated 8 October 2010, informed the Director that if by 15 October 2010, he (the respondent) did not receive any reply to his letter dated 24 August 2010, he would assume that his 2010 application was rejected.

[9] The Director *vide* letter dated 12 October 2010 informed the respondent that:

(1) As of 25 July 2010, a total of 56 projects valued at RM1.72 million had been approved for Sungai Siput. The amount covers contributions, supplies and projects;

(2) The contributions include grants to organizations and societies such as the SMJK Shing Chung (National Type Secondary School) PTA, Methodist School PTA and Nurul Ihsan Orphanage, as stated in the respondent's letter. In addition, the schools of the Orang Asli Community such as Pos Piah National School, Pos Perwor National School and other Orang Asli communities also benefit from the above contributions;

(3) In view of the limited allocations, the aforesaid recipients of the contributions will not be further considered, while others will be assessed on the basis of need; and

(4) For minor projects in the Orang Asli areas, the respondent was advised to submit the applications to the Orang Asli Department.

[10] On the basis of the above factual background, we shall now consider the questions of law raised in the notice of motion.

Writ Of *Quo Warranto*

[11] Senior Federal Counsel Ms Suzana Atan (Ms Narkunavathy Sundareson with her) objected to the respondent's application for leave for a writ of *quo warranto*. They argued that the notice of motion had never challenged the qualifications of the DG and/or the Director to hold public office. There was also no allegation of any flaw in their appointments.

[12] Respondent's learned counsel Dato' Ambiga Sreenevasan (Ms Mahaletchumi Balakrishnan with her) did not refer to the writ of *quo warranto* sought in prayer (1) of the notice of motion. Instead, they relied on paras. 17 to 19 of the respondent's affidavit, purportedly to challenge the qualifications of the DG and the Director to hold office, on the alleged grounds of conflicting statements as to their respective power and authority, and the lack of certainty and inconsistencies as to who holds the power and authority in respect of disbursing the Allocation.

[13] In our view, the question of law which arises for our determination under this head is:

A Having regard to the aforesaid factual background, more specifically prayer (1) in the Notice of Motion seeking a Writ of *Quo Warranto*, and paragraphs 17 to 19 of the Respondent's affidavit, is a Writ of *Quo Warranto* the correct relief?

B **[14]** We begin by stating that *"quo warranto"* is a Latin term. Briefly, it means "By what warrant or authority" an office is held. It is a prerogative writ to challenge the appointment of a person to hold public office, on the ground that he is not qualified to do so or that there was a legal flaw in his appointment. That relief calls for the court to determine whether that person is entitled to
C hold the public office and to discharge his functions.

[15] In order to succeed in an application for a writ of *quo warranto*, the respondent must satisfy three preconditions:

D (1) The office in question has been created by written law;

(2) The office is a public office; and

(3) The person proceeded against is not legally or properly qualified to hold the office.

E

[15A] Preconditions (1) and (2) above are not at issue and do not need elaboration. However, precondition 3 requires further discussion here.

F **[16]** In the instant appeal, it is abundantly clear to us that the writ of *quo warranto* which the respondent sought was directed to all the appellants "to show cause and give information as to their authority to exercise, vest or delegate the discretion to approve and disburse funds from the Allocation and to explain their
G respective roles and relationship in relation to one another".

[17] As a matter of fact, in his capacity as Member of Parliament, the respondent had already sought and obtained in Parliament the relevant information. That is no longer an issue at all. (See pp. 222 to 237 of the appeal record). However, he has now
H repeated this in his prayer for a writ of *quo warranto*.

[18] In addition, our perusal of paras. 17 to 19 of the respondent's affidavit reveals that the respondent was alluding to the "Lack of Transparency and Certainty as well as inconsistencies
I relating to the Allocation, the nature and scope of the discretion vested in the Prime Minister." This averment is not even remotely relevant to a writ of *quo warranto*.

[19] Plainly and obviously, the respondent was not challenging the qualifications and appointments of the DG and the Director or any legal flaw in their qualifications and appointments. The respondent's prayer (1) and paras. 17 to 19 of his affidavit are undoubtedly outside the scope of a writ of *quo warranto*. In particular, the respondent has failed to fulfil precondition (3) above.

[20] Our answer to the above question is therefore in the negative.

Mandamus

[21] It was contended for the appellants that the respondent's application for leave for "a writ of mandamus" was to compel the appellants to:

(1) disclose information in respect of the projects and activities for which the Allocation will be granted; and

(2) grant the respondent's 2010 application.

[22] The appellants cited *Koon Hoi Chow v. Pretam Singh* [1972] 1 LNS 56 HC; and added that:

(1) The respondent has failed to fulfil the conditions contained in s. 44 of the Specific Relief Act 1950 ("s. 44") in relation to performance of public duties; and

(2) *Mandamus* is inapplicable to the Director's exercise of discretion.

[23] On the other hand, the respondent relied on *Hong Leong Equipment Sdn Bhd v. Liew Fook Chuan & Other Appeals* [1997] 1 CLJ 665 CA, 736 b to 740 i, and submitted that:

(1) There is a distinction between "a writ of *mandamus*" and "an order of *mandamus*"; and

(2) The requirements of s. 44 apply to a writ of *mandamus* but not to an order of *mandamus* which the respondent is now seeking.

[24] The question of law which we have to decide herein is:

A In the light of the discretion to approve and disburse funds as stated in prayer (1) of the Notice of Motion, was the learned Judge correct in granting leave for an Order of *Mandamus* to compel the Appellants to specify information in respect of the disbursement of the Allocation; and to compel the Appellants to grant the Respondent's application *vide* letter dated 9 July 2010?

B

[25] We find it necessary to correct the expression "writ of *mandamus*" used by learned Senior Federal Counsel. That expression is a misnomer. In any event, the respondent is not asking for a "writ of *mandamus*". He is praying for an order of C *mandamus*. Section 49 of the Specific Relief Act 1950 prohibits the courts from issuing any "writ of *mandamus*". It has in effect abolished such a writ. It provides follows:

Bar to issue of mandamus

D

49 Neither the High Court nor any other court in Malaysia shall hereafter issue any writ of *mandamus*.

[26] Legally speaking, the former writ of *mandamus* is now replaced by an order of *mandamus*.

E

[27] The law governing the grant or refusal of an order of *mandamus* is to be gathered from three pieces of legislation. More specifically, the relevant provisions are contained in:

(1) S. 44;

F

(2) Para 1 of the Schedule to the Courts of Judicature Act 1964 ("the Schedule"); and

(3) O. 53

G (see: eg, *Hong Leong Equipment, supra*).

[28] Section 44 is housed in Chapter VII ("Enforcement of Public Duties") of the Specific Relief Act 1950. The relevant portion in s. 44(1) reads:

H

Power to order public servants and others to do certain specific acts.

44(1) A Judge may make an order requiring any specific act to be done or forborne, by any person holding a public office …:

I

Provided that -

(a) an application for such an order be made by some person whose property, ..., or personal right would be injured by the forbearing or doing, as the case may be, of the said specific act;

(b) such doing or forbearing is, under any law for the time being in force, clearly incumbent on the person or court in his or its public character, ...;

(c) in the opinion of the Judge the doing or forbearing is consonant to right and justice;

(d) the applicant has no other specific and adequate legal remedy; and

(e) the remedy given by the order applied for will be complete.

[29] In an application for an order of *mandamus*, these five conditions are cumulative. All of them must be satisfied. In *Koon Hoi Chow, supra*, Sharma J enunciated the following principles:

(1) An order under s. 44 is in its nature an order of *mandamus*. It is a peremptory order of the court commanding somebody to do that which it was his clear legal duty to do. The applicant seeking such an order must have a legal right to the performance of such duty by the person against whom the order is sought;

(2) The prerequisites essential to the issue of an order under s. 44 or of a *mandamus* are:

(a) Whether the applicant in the High Court has a clear and specific legal right to the relief sought;

(b) Whether there is a duty imposed by law on the public officer(s);

(c) Whether such duty is of an imperative ministerial character involving no judgment or discretion on the part of the public officer(s); and

(d) Whether the applicant has any remedy, other than by way of *mandamus*, for the enforcement of the right which has been denied to him.

(3) These are the questions, but only some of the questions, which are necessary to be answered in every application for *mandamus*. The applicant must show not only that he has a legal right to have the act performed but that the right is so clear and well defined as to be free from any reasonable controversy. The order cannot issue when the right is doubtful, or is a qualified one or where it depends upon an issue of fact to be determined by the public officer(s).

[30] In the instant appeal, the disbursement of the Allocation is entrusted to the DG and/or the Director, who would consider each application in accordance with the guidelines for that purpose. This involves an exercise of discretion based on a detailed and comprehensive process of evaluation. The DG and/or the Director is not required to approve all and sundry applications for the Allocation. The respondent must show, *inter alia*, that there is a legal or statutory duty on the part of the DG and/or the Director as a matter of course to approve his 2010 application. The respondent must establish the existence of a duty of a public nature, the performance of which is imperative and not optional or discretionary. The respondent has failed to do so. The notice of motion is clearly premised on the DG's and/or the Director's "discretion to approve and disburse funds." There is not an *iota* of law that the DG and/or the Director must do so.

[31] In the circumstances, our answer to the above question is in the negative.

Policy Considerations And Management Prerogative

[32] The appellants took the position that the reliefs itemized in the notice of motion are non-reviewable and non-justifiable, because they involve policy considerations and the management prerogative of the DG and/or the Director, whose decision involves an exercise of discretion based on a detailed and comprehensive process of evaluation. The appellants referred to:

(1) *R Rama Chandran v. Industrial Court of Malaysia Anor* [1997] 1 CLJ 147 at pp. 183-185 SC;

(2) *Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister for Civil Service* [1994] 3 All ER 935 HL; and

(3) *Kumpulan Perangsang Selangor Bhd v. Zaid Mohd Noh* [1997] 2 CLJ 11, pp. 24-25 SC.

[33] The stand taken for the respondent is that: A

(1) There is no factual support that the notice of motion involves a management prerogative or policy considerations which are non-justifiable;

(2) Decisions of the Executive that arise from a prerogative or B policy are amenable to judicial review; and

(3) The question of whether a management prerogative is amenable to judicial review is to be dealt with at the "substantial" *(sic)* motion. C

[34] The question of law for our determination herein is:

> Are the reliefs sought by the Respondent in the Notice of Motion matters of policy considerations and management prerogative of the DG and/or the Director and therefore non-reviewable and D non-justifiable?

[35] In our view, and as implied in the notice of motion, there can be no doubt that the approval and disbursement of the fund involves an exercise of discretion. The DG and/or the Director E must evaluate the applications for the Allocation. These applications can only be decided by the DG and/or the Director in line with policy considerations and management prerogative. The factual background did show that the appellants had approved respondent's application amounting to RM1.72 million, while other F applications are being given consideration. The Director has given practical suggestions to the respondent to channel relevant applications to relevant Government agencies. In the process of evaluation, the DG and/or the Director must comprehensively balance and safeguard the disbursement of the Allocation, G consistent with Government policy and guidelines. Our courts do not possess the knowledge of policy considerations that underlie the decisions pursuant to the DG and/or the Director's evaluation. In this regard, the judicial approach is settled. Within our shores, our apex court and in England, the (then) House of Lords have H applied concurrent principles, as illustrated below:

(1) Where policy considerations are involved in administrative decisions and courts do not possess knowledge of the policy considerations which underlie such decisions, courts ought not I to review the reasoning of the administrative body, with a

A view to substituting their own opinion on the basis of what they consider to be fair and reasonable on the merits, for to do so would amount to a usurpation of power on the part of the courts: See *R Rama Chandran, supra,* per Edgar Joseph Jr FCJ (as he then was) at pp. 183 to 184.

B

(2) There may be cases in which for reasons of eg, public policy, it may be wholly inappropriate for the courts to attempt any substitution of views. Unlike the Executive, the Judiciary is not armed with all the information relevant to such matters. The C High Court, in the exercise of its discretionary power, should decline to enter into the merits of a decision involving these policy considerations: See *Kumpulan Perangsang Selangor Bhd, supra*, per Gopal Sri Ram JCA, speaking for the (then) Supreme Court, at pp. 24-25.

D

(3) Lord Diplock has also expressed a similar sentiment in his speech in *Council of Civil Service Unions, supra,* at p. 411.

[36] Reverting to the instant appeal, as the issues raised in the notice of motion are issues of policy considerations and E management prerogative, we find that the submission presented for the respondent is legally unsustainable. Therefore, we are of the view that the issues raised in the notice of motion are not judicially reviewable, and hence not justifiable.

F **[37]** Our answer to the above question is in the affirmative.

Conclusion

[38] On the foregoing grounds, we hold that the learned judge of the High Court has erred in granting leave for judicial review. We G allow this appeal, set aside the order of the High Court and substitute it with an order that the notice of motion be dismissed.

[39] In the exercise of our discretion, we make no order as to costs here and in the court below.

H

I